

militarism, the threatening shadow of the sword, which, unless France were careful, would lead her to dictatorship.

Behind all else he showed the Chnrch bent on reviving the-ocracy and intolerance. And with respect to the Affair itself, after complaining that the public mind had been poisoned against those who had resolved to elucidate the truth, he pointed out that if Dreyfus had been condemned

on a document written by another (Esterhazy), whose guilt could be proved thereby, a revision of his case would be an imperative, logical necessity, for there could not be two persons condemned for the same crime. Besides, Dreyfus had been legally condemned on the *bordereau* alone — the only paper shown to his counsel — and even if there were other papers which in defiance of the law had been kept secret, who could refuse revision if it were proved that the *borde-reau*, the one known, acknowledged document, was from the hand of another man ?

But the French War Office was determined that the authorship of the "*bordereau*" should not be brought home to Walsin-Esterhazy. General Saussier, Military Governor of Paris, one of the few unprejudiced army chiefs of that time, had ordered a prosecution, but the investigations were carried out by the unscrupulous General de Pellieux, behind whom was the even more unscrupulous Colonel Henry of the Intelligence Bureau, and the acquittal

of Esterhazy
was virtually prearranged. The charge
against him —
as preferred by .M. Mathieu Dreyfus—was
that of
having written the *bordereau* for which.
Alfred Drey-
fus had been condemned, but at the court-
martial of
January 10 and 11, 1898, that definite
accusation was never
considered. The proceedings were turned
against another